

EDMONDS CITY COUNCIL APPROVED MINUTES

July 19, 2016

ELECTED OFFICIALS PRESENT

Dave Earling, Mayor
Kristiana Johnson, Council President
Michael Nelson, Councilmember
Diane Buckshnis, Councilmember
Dave Teitzel, Councilmember
Thomas Mesaros, Councilmember
Neil Tibbott, Councilmember

ELECTED OFFICIALS ABSENT

Adrienne Fraley-Monillas, Councilmember

STAFF PRESENT

M. Bower, Police Officer
Phil Williams, Public Works Director
Carrie Hite, Parks, Rec. & Cult. Serv. Dir.
Scott James, Finance Director
Rob Chave, Planning Manager
Rob English, City Engineer
Kernen Lien, Senior Planner
Jeff Taraday, City Attorney
Scott Passey, City Clerk
Andrew Pierce, Legislative/Council Assistant
Jerrie Bevington, Camera Operator
Jeannie Dines, Recorder

1. CALL TO ORDER/FLAG SALUTE

The Edmonds City Council meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Mayor Earling in the Council Chambers, 250 5th Avenue North, Edmonds. The meeting was opened with the flag salute.

2. ROLL CALL

City Clerk Scott Passey called the roll. All elected officials were present with the exception of Councilmember Fraley-Monillas.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

COUNCILMEMBER TEITZEL MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER TIBBOTT, TO APPROVE THE AGENDA IN CONTENT AND ORDER. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS

COUNCILMEMBER MESAROS MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER TEITZEL, TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. The agenda items approved are as follows:

- 1. APPROVAL OF COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF JULY 12, 2016**
- 2. APPROVAL OF CLAIM AND PAYROLL CHECKS**
- 3. CLAIM FOR DAMAGES**
- 4. WILHOIT PROPERTY DONATION**
- 5. AMENDMENT #3 ILA WDFW FISHING PIER**

6. **AUTHORIZATION FOR MAYOR TO SIGN A SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT WITH BERGERABAM FOR THE FISHING PIER REHABILITATION PROJECT**
7. **PRESENTATION OF GOODS & MATERIALS AGREEMENT FOR SOLE SOURCE JUSTIFICATION FOR THE PROCUREMENT OF STONE CLADDING, PAVING AND SITE FURNISHINGS FOR THE VETERAN'S PLAZA FROM COLDSRING**
8. **AUTHORIZATION FOR MAYOR TO EXECUTE A LEASE AGREEMENT WITH NEOPOST FOR POSTAGE METER EQUIPMENT**
9. **CITIZEN BOARD CANDIDATE INTERVIEWS - EDMONDS PUBLIC FACILITIES DISTRICT CANDIDATE APPOINTMENTS**

5. **AUDIENCE COMMENTS**

Alan Mearns, Edmonds, expressed concern with reducing the buffer on the Edmonds Marsh and recommended retaining at least a 100-foot buffer all the way around. He pointed out there was little information in the State and Council's materials regarding wildlife and species in the marsh. He and the Pilchuck Audubon have put out a call for data regarding species that live in the marsh; there are 177 species that they know of based on 1,200 checklists by volunteers. He provided a handout from a birder, Bill Anderson, whose data is divided into habitats within the marsh including the buffer zones, the marsh wetland, the hatchery, etc. includes approximately 95 species. He looked forward to receiving more information to assist with understanding the utilization of the different areas of the marsh by birds and wildlife. He also provided a bar graph of the number of species that Mr. Anderson has recorded over the past three years. Mr. Anderson has also photographed many of the birds and wildlife in the marsh. Mr. Mearns referred to a photograph he provided the Council of a Sora, a rare, distinct marsh bird that lives in the cattails around the periphery of the marsh. Most of the birds are on the migratory bird list and are protected, 93 of the 95 on Mr. Anderson's list are protected species.

Gene Wisemiller, Edmonds, spoke regarding the downgrading of the category of the Edmonds Marsh. In his research he found a 1910 map of Edmonds and was amazed to see the City had already divided and subdivided into lots except for a large area that would eventually be called the Edmonds Marsh. All the lots were eventually built out but due to its nature, the marsh area was not developed as quickly and eventually the ownership passed to the City. As the City grew, even this undesirable land became more attractive, first a highway was built across it, then a commercial development built on one side and a seawall that cut off the tidal exchange; activities that began to degrade the pristine estuary and it eventually no longer deserved to be classified as Category I and pressure mounted to downgrade it to Category II. His research indicated Category II status would result in relaxed buffer widths needed to protect the wetland from adjacent development as well as reduce the amount of mitigation required for impacts to the wetland which will compromise the permitted uses. The Washington State Wetland Rating System states a Category I wetland represents a unique and rare wetland. He argued the Edmonds Marsh is a unique and therefore the current Category I status should be retained. The alternative is a continued degradation of this unique resource and risk people saying in 100 years that there used to be a marsh there.

David Richman, Edmonds, a former faculty member at New Mexico State University, said people in New Mexico highly value their water; the Rio Grande River is often completely dry. New Mexico has freshwater and saline marshes. During visits to the Edmonds Marsh he has seen Great Blue Herons and was certain there were Soras due to the habitat. He recently encountered a person photographing Belted Kingfishers. Based on his experience as a biologist, he cautioned the Council to deal with wetlands very carefully. Wetlands are important, it is too easy to degrade them and unless they have the proper buffer, they will certain degrade. In the desert despite laws against taking cacti, a developer will level a cactus

forest. The Edmonds Marsh is a wonderful resource; it should be improved and nothing done to degrade it.

April Richardson, Edmonds, displayed a pencil sketch she did in the Edmonds Marsh; the marsh is a beautiful place to see animal life. While she was visiting the marsh, she was asked if she had seen the resident coyote. She also heard someone remarking they had seen a herd of five deer which she found amazing right on edge of the town. She summarized the Edmonds Marsh is a spectacular, wonderful place.

Marty Jones, Edmonds, referred to the Great Washington State Birding Trail, a map of premier and unique birding locations throughout the State, prepared in collaboration with Audubon of Washington, Department of Fish and Wildlife, Department of Transportation and the Washington State Community Trade and Economic Development Department. The first stop on the Cascade Loop of the birding trail is the Edmonds Marsh and waterfront and lists several interesting birds that are not seen many other places. She has been a docent at the marsh during the Puget Sound Birdfest and was amazed how many people visit the Edmonds Marsh from out of state. Birding is a huge industry; people travel to see birds and spend money. The Edmonds Marsh is a unique situation, a saltwater marsh where people can walk on the boardwalks and see birds and wildlife and then walk a block downtown to fine dining and shopping. She urged the Council to do everything possible to protect this treasure to ensure it exists for future generations. The best thing for the wildlife, city and state is to protect the marsh as much as possible.

Rebecca Wolfe, Edmonds, commented on the future daylighting of Willow Creek. She urged the Council not to reduce the Edmonds Marsh buffer for the reasons previously stated. Her interest is in the science; the ratings for the buffer were done in 2004 and when it was updated in 2014 it was her understanding there was no mention of changing the ratings. Since 2004, more is known about global warming/climate change and it is accepted by more people as well as more is known about projected sea level rise, all of which tie into streams and fish which need to be protected. In preparing a paper she did about the Edmonds Marsh for the program she is in, she learned from Keely O'Connell, Valerie Stewart and others that blue carbon is one of the best ways to store carbon and marsh grasses store 4-6 times more carbon than forests. She cited the importance of grassy marshes; Puget Sound is in grave danger from pollution, PCBs, runoff, etc. and needs to be protected. Edmonds Marsh is a rare wetland and marsh in Puget Sound. In October 2015 President Obama issued an order to all agencies stating any new project must include ecosystem science values.

Susie Schaefer, Edmonds, submitted written materials regarding the demo garden, noting Councilmembers Buckshnis and Nelson have visited the demo garden. She invited Councilmembers to visit the demo garden, advising a work party is scheduled on August 6. She has learned a lot from the demo garden including cooperation with groups in the city and that people will do things when you ask them. They built the garden for almost nothing and have even gotten money from Chevron to buy plants. She has been watching the marsh for years; she moved to Edmonds in 1980 and saw the buildings and tennis courts constructed in the marsh and the pervious paths replaced with cement paths. After watching the marsh be beleaguered for years, she urged that to stop and for the City to take care of this valuable resource.

Lynette Petrie, Edmonds, said her interest is in natural places. Edmonds is so fortunate to have this marsh; it is a resource beyond compare and needs to be valued. As Ms. Jones stated, the marsh attracts visitors, it is an economic as well as a natural resource and it can help educate children. She pleaded for the Council to value this resource and build the value of it into the City's plans.

Bea Wilson, Edmonds, cited her volunteer efforts that include the planning committee for Edmonds Birdfest, a WSU beach watcher and beach naturalist, SnoKing Watershed Council, steward with Global Water Watch, removing invasives and planting natives in backyard wildlife habitats and in watersheds,

and coordinating beach cleanups. People enjoy the serenity and peace of nature which is essential for spiritual wellbeing of all humans. She agreed with Ms. Schaefer that people will help when asked. She testified to the natural wonder of youth and families who visit the beach on a low tide. The Edmonds Marsh is valuable and unique. She has participated in cleanups at Kayak Point and seen how the community is working to preserve their marsh. She referred to Snohomish County's purchase of Hooven Bog, noting Edmonds already owns Edmonds Marsh, it only needs to be maintained. People from throughout the world visit the marsh during the Edmonds Birdfest. She thanked the City for what they have done and said more could be done such as the Category I designation.

Carlo Voli, Edmonds, said 30 years from now he wants to be able to tell his grandchildren that thanks to an enlighten Mayor and City Council in July 2016 who decided to protect the unique marsh and retain the Category I with a 100-foot buffer, wildlife flourishes in this unique salt marsh. He has volunteered at the marsh and the demo garden and finds it a very special area. He implored the Council to protect the marsh and retain the Category I and let the passionate community help to restore it and bring it back to its glory.

6. **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

1. **PUBLIC HEARING TO RECEIVE CITIZENS' COMMENTS ON PROPOSED SIGN CODE AMENDMENTS**

Planning Manager Rob Chave explained these are focused amendments; there will be future amendments related to Supreme Court decision regarding content neutrality. The City Council asked the Planning Board to specifically look at temporary signs, especially A-frame signs. He displayed photographs and described sign types:

- Pedestrian signs (new term)
 - A-frame, easel, stanchion and similar signs
- Projecting / blade signs
 - Usually found under awnings but may project off a wall or hanger
 - Encouraged by City
 - Does not count against overall sign area
 - Helps identify and promote businesses in an unobtrusive, attractive way
- Monument signs
 - Free standing

Mr. Chave reviewed Planning Board public hearing options related to pedestrian signs:

	Option 1: No Portables (A-frames)	Option 2: Pedestrian Signs as Temporary Signs (Existing Code)	Option 3: Pedestrian Signs as Permanent Signs with restrictions
Pedestrian Sign Permitted?	No	Yes	Yes
Size Allowed	No	6 sq. ft.	6 sq. ft.
Location Allowed	No	w/in 2 ft. of building or street edge; 4 ft. clear zone	w/in 2 ft. of building or street edge; 4 ft. clear zone
How Many	No	1 per business	1 per storefront
Duration	No	60 days per year	When business is open
Benefits of approach?	?	?	?

He reviewed the Planning Board's recommendation:

- Option 3 for pedestrian signs:

- A form of permanent signage with restrictions, and counts against overall sign area (no longer classified as “temporary”)
- Only one per ground floor entrance
- Only allowed while business is open
- Businesses may rotate their signs
- Locate within 10 feet of entry
- Minimum 5 feet of pedestrian clearance; prefer within 2 feet of building or curb
- Maximum 6 sq. ft. in size

Mr. Chave reviewed other proposed code modifications:

- “Directional Symbols” allowed for directions
- Symbols can be illuminated (not just letters)
- Halo signs specifically allowed
- Sign height tied to actual finished grade
- Monument signs better defined, minimum setback
- 1-story buildings with mansard recognized
- Sign area practice codified (calculate outlines)
- ADB can grant modifications due to unique architectural elements of a building

Mayor Earling opened the public participation portion of the public hearing

Natalie Shippen, Edmonds, emphasized a pedestrian sign is a temporary sign. The Council has been told the focus of the sign code update has been on temporary, portable signs which have proliferated in the Bowl. Temporary signs are the least desirable, creating obstacles and social blight on City streets which is why many municipalities limit them, hence the term “temporary” because no one wants them permanently as proposed in Option 3. The current Edmonds Code contains a list of temporary signs, Option 3 changes 4 of the temporary signs to permanent. She referred to the list of additional recommendations that accompany Option 3: limit the number, location/placement, square footage, and height and require a permit, suggesting these tight regulations indicate what a nuisance temporary signs can become. She referred to the statement that none of the recommended changes would substantially change the number of signs currently allowed by the sign code, pointing out the current Edmonds sign code has an important restriction on temporary signs, limiting the frequency of display to 60 days per calendar year. The proposal has no limit on display time which will allow temporary signs to be displayed on downtown streets 365 days/year. Option 3 is a giveaway of municipal streets to promote cheap advertising, streets that have taken many years and thousands of dollars to make attractive. She questioned how such a major change could be made without a valid reason, going from 60 days for a temporary sign to 365 days, and what warranted such a major change.

Robert Boehlke, Edmonds, owner of HouseWares, and President of the Edmonds Downtown Alliance, was pleased with the work done by staff and the Planning Board to develop Option 3 and he encouraged the Council to implement Option 3 as recommended. He noted temporary signs are a valuable form of advertising for a lot of small businesses. Temporary signs catch pedestrians while they walk by a storefront in the split second where the decision is made to go in or walk by. The proposed changes to the sign code are very favorable.

Kimberly Koenig, Edmonds, owner of Rogue and representing the Downtown Edmonds Merchants Association, said it is important for businesses to thrive and contribute to downtown and pedestrian signs are an important part. She reported pedestrian signs can represent up to 30% of business for a small business. She urged the Council to consider Option 3 as recommended by the Planning Board.

Hearing no further comment, Mayor Earling closed the public participation portion of the public hearing

Councilmember Teitzel referred to language in the proposed sign code (page 299 of the packet), “The preferred locations are within two feet of the building face or within two feet of the curb if that location does not block access to parked vehicles.” Although not a particular fan of A-frame signs and believes they contribute to blight downtown, he recognized businesses rely on them to generate business so there is a reason to keep them for the time being. However, he did not want some signs next to the building and others out by the street as it created a zigzag appearance that looked messy and cluttered. He preferred to strike “within two feet of the curb.” For a business that had a valid need for a sign by the curb, he asked whether a variance process could be provided. Mr. Chave did not recommend a variance. One of the things staff will consider when issuing a permit for a pedestrian sign is the location. Although he understood the desire for uniformity, the difficulty with limiting the location to within two feet of the building is there may already be things at the street such as trees, street furniture, etc. and it may make sense to have sign at the curb and keep the area in front of the building clear. He noted every situation is unique; if it was the Council consensus, staff could work with the City Attorney to strengthen the preference for locating signs within two feet of the building but have an exception process for a staff decision.

Councilmember Buckshnis said she does not rely on signs, she looks at the interior and goes in every store. She believed businesses place excess reliance on A-board signs and would have liked a 60-day period without A-board signs. She referred to Ms. Shippen’s comment about signs no longer having a 60-day limit and now being permanent signs. Mr. Chave anticipated there ultimately will be fewer signs due to the limitation of one per entrance and the permit will make enforcement easier. One of the Planning Board’s recommendations which the BID supports is exploring other ways of advertising businesses.

Councilmember Teitzel recalled a comment from Pam Stuller, Walnut Street Coffee, whose business is difficult to see from 5th Avenue, that it was valuable to have sign on 5th Avenue to direct customers to her store, especially when her business first opened. He suggested allowing new businesses located off a main street to have an off-premises sign for 60-day period and after the 60-day period, comply with the terms of sign code. Mr. Chave responded that could be difficult to write in a content-neutral manner. The argument would be it’s specific to particular business and the only way to determine whether it was allowed would be to read the sign. That may be possible but would require further research. He was hopeful there were other ways to accomplish that such as mobile apps. He was concerned with off-site signage, even temporarily, because once it is allowed, it can go in a direction the Council may not like. Councilmember Teitzel saw a purpose for an A-frame sign for a new business which benefits downtown vibrancy. He asked staff to consider his suggestion.

Councilmember Mesaros referred to Councilmember Teitzel’s remarks about requiring the sign within two feet of building, pointing out every business and property is unique and applying one rule throughout the downtown area may not be appropriate. He encouraged flexibility when the permit is submitted with regard to the best location on the property and as it relates to other permitted signs on the block to avoid a zigzag appearance.

Councilmember Nelson thanked the Planning Board for their work and for gathering input from businesses and citizens. The proposed sign code is a good compromise, a first step at regulate signs that have not been regulated before. If necessary, the sign code can be tweaked in six months. He referred to the proposed sign code (page 299) “The sign shall be located within 10 feet of the building entry, unless it is placed in a location that better preserves public pedestrian and vehicular access.” and asked if that meant the sign could be beyond 10 feet if it improved pedestrian or vehicular access. Mr. Chave said that would be considered in the permitting process. The preference is within 10 feet but there needs to be flexibility due to existing trees, bistro dining, etc.

Councilmember Tibbott spoke in favor of the Planning Board’s recommendation with regard to limiting the number of pedestrian signs. The proposal will allow businesses to be creative regarding signs in

window, blade signs, etc. He pointed out an A-frame signs that is 6 square feet on one side also has 6 square feet on the other side for a total of 12 square feet. He suggested that could make an A-frame sign advantageous to a business compared to other signage. Mr. Chave said the reason both sides of the sign are not counted is only one side of the sign is visible at a time. That is the general rule for all signs types except wall signs. He was hesitant to single out A-frame signs and double the sign area and suggested if the Council wanted to limit signs to 3 feet, the code should state 3 feet. Councilmember Tibbott reiterated it provides some advantage to a business using an A-frame versus another sign type. He concurred with Councilmember Teitzel's suggestion to give preference to new businesses, allowing them to display a temporary banner, a pedestrian sign, etc. for the first 60 days, allowing them to advertise in a unique and special way. Mr. Chave said staff will consider that; the only concern is allowing them off site.

Mr. Chave said this is topic scheduled for a follow-up meeting. The original intent was an ordinance; staff could return with the requested research along with a draft ordinance and specific amendments. Mayor Earling suggested a draft ordinance with amendments based on comments made tonight. The Council could then vote on the amendments and ordinance. Council President Johnson suggested having all three options on the agenda for consideration as the Council has not decided which option to pursue. Mr. Chave suggested Council provide direction on the option.

COUNCILMEMBER TIBBOTT MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER NELSON TO USE OPTION 3 AS A BASIS FOR THE ORDINANCE.

Councilmember Buckshnis commented the Council has never voted immediately following a public hearing. Some Councilmembers may need more time to consider audience comments, etc.

Councilmember Teitzel supported proceeding with Option 3 and directing staff to prepare the ordinance as the basis with amendments for Council consideration. He was comfortable Option 3 was the most reasonable approach.

Council President Johnson echoed Councilmember Buckshnis' comment, explaining it has long been the Council's tradition not to take a vote directly after a public hearing to allow Councilmembers to consider the information provided at the public hearing. She was convinced the reason these options were being considered was due to Ms. Shippen's work and her concerns about visual clutter. As stated by Ms. Shippen, Option 3 makes 60-day temporary signs permanent for 365 days and she wanted an opportunity to consider that further. The business community believes pedestrian signs are very valuable to their businesses, a 30% increase in advertising, but others are not as interested in A-board signs. The Council has only heard from a few people at the public hearing and she preferred to hear more from the community before making a decision.

Councilmember Mesaros referred to the concern with the Council taking a vote after a public hearing, explaining the Council was not voting on the ordinance; Council was giving staff direction regarding the ordinance to prepare. Although this vote follows a public hearing, it is not a final vote. For example, if a majority of the Council wanted to pursue Option 1 or 2, that could be done at the next Council meeting. He supported the motion to give staff direction regarding preparation of an ordinance.

MOTION CARRIED (4-2), COUNCIL PRESIDENT JOHNSON AND COUNCILMEMBER BUCKSHNIS VOTING NO.

7. ACTION ITEMS

1. EDMONDS WATERFRONT CENTER AND BEACH REHAB SCHEMATIC DESIGN REVIEW

Parks & Recreation Director Carrie Hite Council recalled the Council approved a lease agreement with the Senior Center that allowed the Center to proceed with a capital campaign and develop a proposal to rebuild the Center on the waterfront site. The Council was provided a very thorough presentation last week and forwarded the matter to this week's Council meeting for action. She requested the Council authorize the Mayor to sign The letter in the packet approving the schematic design of the new Waterfront Center. The Senior Center is also required to come to the Council for approval of design development and the construction phase. Senior Center Executive Director Farrell Fleming was present to answer questions.

COUNCILMEMBER MESAROS MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER BUCKSHNIS, TO AUTHORIZE THE MAYOR TO SIGN LETTER APPROVING THE SCHEMATIC DESIGN OF THE NEW WATERFRONT CENTER.

Council President Johnson said she visited the Senior Center this weekend and saw many people on the waterfront playing Pokémon Go. She suggested there be a way for people on the beach to access the coffee shop from outside. Ms. Hite advised the design has a window that opens onto the park. Under the proposed sign code, they could put an A-board sign directing people to it.

Councilmember Buckshnis reported Mr. Fleming, Mr. Johnson and she went to the Woodway Town Council meeting last night and it was very well received.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

2. AUTHORIZING MAYOR TO EXECUTE INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT WITH WESTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY ON SUSTAINABLE CITIES PARTNERSHIP

Planning Manager Rob Chave said this is a follow up to discussions the Council had in April when a resolution was passed authorizing staff to apply for the program. The City was accepted into program; the packet contains a proposed Interlocal Agreement and an impressive list of projects that will benefit the City. Staff is eager and supportive of moving forward.

Councilmember Buckshnis was impressed with the list of projects and the dollar amount for each. She relayed the Mayor's Climate Protection Committee and the Tree Board have offered their resources to assist the students. Mr. Chave said one of reasons the list looks like this is staff looked to the Strategic Action Plan and other programs such as Zero Waste.

Councilmember Nelson was particularly interested in exploring zero waste and food waste, sea level rise, and green business. He noted the large cost of the wastewater treatment plant project was due to hiring an intern. He commended staff on a job well done.

Councilmember Tibbott was impressed with the list of 10 projects, commenting the list was far more impressive than he originally envisioned. He echoed Councilmember Buckshnis' suggestion to utilize the strength of City commissions; many citizens would be happy to share their extensive experience base with the students. For example, the Economic Development Commission would be interested in assisting with the Tourism Mobile App. Mr. Chave said the BID has also expressed a strong interest in that project.

Council President Johnson recalled the wastewater treatment plant was originally a video as well as a brochure; she asked what happened to the video. Mr. Chave answered it was determined developing signs and content for WWTP tours would be a better use of students' time.

COUNCILMEMBER BUCKSHNIS MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCIL PRESIDENT JOHNSON, TO APPROVE THE DRAFT INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT FINALIZING EDMONDS' PARTICIPATION IN THE SUSTAINABLE CITIES PARTNERSHIP FOR 2016-2017.

Mayor Earling thanked staff for their great work on this.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mayor Earling declared a brief recess.

COUNCILMEMBER BUCKSHNIS MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER NELSON, TO REVERSE THE ORDER OF ITEMS 8.1 AND 8.2. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

8. STUDY ITEMS

2. SHORELINE MASTER PROGRAM UPDATE

Senior Planner Kernen Lien reviewed the initial response to Ecology:

- Draft letter in Exhibit 10
 - Agree with critical area regulations integration
 - Need more time for UMU IV evaluation and response
 - Anticipate 30 – 60 days for a more detailed response
 - Revisions recommended by Council President Council President Johnson
 - Reword paragraph regarding the need for additional time to evaluate the proposed changes
 - Reword request regarding how much additional time is acceptable for fuller response

COUNCILMEMBER BUCKSHNIS MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER TIBBOTT, TO APPROVE THE INITIAL RESPONSE TO ECOLOGY WITH THE CHANGES PROPOSED BY COUNCIL PRESIDENT JOHNSON.

Councilmember Teitzel referred to the sentence, “Please advise the City how much additional time is acceptable for a fuller response,” commenting some Councilmembers are interested in having a special study conducted which may take longer than 60-90 days. He asked what would happen if Ecology agreed to 90 days and it took much longer to assess the issue. **David Pater, Regional Shoreline Planner, Washington State Department of Ecology**, said the City could send another letter requesting more time and explaining why more time was needed. Ecology is interested in keeping the momentum going.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Lien reviewed Ecology required changes:

- Five critical area integration changes
- Three UMU IV Required Change
 - Setback/buffer
 - Interim Designation
 - When buffer establishment triggered
- Recommended change to consider residential in UMU IV

Mr. Lien reviewed policy considerations:

- Marsh setback/buffer
 - What is the goal for the Edmonds Marsh?
 - What is goal for the UMU IV shoreline environment?
 - How can the SMP setback/buffer for the marsh help achieve these goals within the legal framework of the SMA?
- Interim Designation

- *Establishing the Urban Mixed-Use IV designation as an interim designation will allow the City, in cooperation with property owners, Ecology, scientists, interested agencies/organizations, and members of the public to carefully review effects of establishing a new shoreline jurisdiction for the area around the marsh on existing and planned development as well as the ecological role the Edmonds Marsh plays in the City of Edmonds.* (SMP pg. 31)
- Ecology notes no longer necessary
- Consider the purpose of interim designation and whether maintaining interim designation provides any benefits
- Other
 - Whether the SMP needs to prohibit residential in the UMU IV shoreline designation
 - Ecology's recommendation is to streamline future consideration. If Harbor Square were rezoned to allow residential development, that would also require a change to the SMP and the Ecology process.

Mr. Lien reviewed process options:

- Pursuant to RCW 90.58.090(2)(e), the City of Edmonds has two options for responding to Ecology's conditional approval:
 1. Agree to the proposed changes, or
 2. Submit an alternative proposal. Ecology will then review the alternative(s) submitted for consistency with the purpose and intent of the changes originally submitted by Ecology with the Shoreline Management Act.
- Commission independent wetland determination
 - An independent wetland report has found the marsh to be a Category II wetland applying Ecology's standards
 - Estimated cost:
 - Categorization: \$3,000
 - Categorization and delineation: \$8,000
 - Categorization, delineation and delineation of salt tolerant vegetation: \$13,000

Mr. Lien commented there is some confusion with regard to the tide gate, salt tolerant vegetation and the marsh categorization. He displayed an aerial of map of the Edmonds Marsh that illustrates how it was identified as a shoreline of the state and required the new shoreline designation. He identified the boundaries of the marsh at different points in time, 1878 when the marsh extended to Main Street, 1944, 1964, 2002 and 2006, noting the salt portion of the marsh has shrunk over the years. During the SMP update, Ecology determined the marsh to be a shoreline of the state rather than an associated wetland which means the shoreline jurisdiction extends beyond the marsh. That is verified by, 1) determining whether the marsh is tidally influenced; the December 2010 study found there is tidal influence even with gate closed, and 2) establishing where the salt tolerant vegetation is located. He referred to the aerial photos which illustrates where the vegetation changes; the western portion has one plant community and the eastern portion where the cattails begin has another plant community that is not salt tolerant.

Mr. Lien displayed another aerial view from a survey done by WSDOT as part of the Edmonds Crossing project and identified the salt marsh. boundary. To the question of how the marsh would change if Willow Creek is daylighted, he said the overall boundaries of the marsh would not change due to the dike and development but the plant community would change. He identified the 10-foot elevation mark which is approximately the mean high or high tide of Puget Sound. If Willow Creek is daylighted and tidal influence is allowed to flow freely, the blue hatched area on the map would convert to salt marsh. He clarified the tidal gate and the salt tolerant plant community are used to determine whether this is an estuarine marsh and shoreline of the state. It has been determined the marsh is an estuarine wetland and a shoreline of state. The agreed upon boundary of the shoreline jurisdiction is the 2006 line. He emphasized

this is a planning level document; when a project is proposed, the exact boundary of the marsh and the ordinary high water mark (OHWM) would be determined by a qualified professional.

Paul Anderson, Wetland Specialist, Washington State Department of Ecology, referred to Table 4.1 Wetlands code comparison in the City's CAO. Last week he was uncertain of the initial basis for classifying the Edmonds Marsh as a Category I wetland. A document was provided to Development Services Director Shane Hope by Ken Reidy, 2004 BAS Review by EDAW, Inc., prepared for the Council during the review of the CAO update in 2004. Table 4.1 in that document summarized the current classification system the City was using. Ecology's update to the 1993 rating system came out in spring 2004. In 2004 prior to the update, the City was using a three-tier classification system for wetlands, Class 1, 2 and 3. Ecology has been accused of downgrading the wetland but that is not the case; going from a three-tier to a four-tier system allows for a more refined classification. EDAW's BAS document addresses better protection of this Class 1 wetland, referencing the classification system in place at that time.

Mr. Anderson explained when the City adopted Ordinance 3527 in November 2004, it adopted the 2004 Wetland Rating System as well as the 1993 Washington State Wetland Rating System, both of which were 4-tiered systems. The criteria carried forward into the 2004 Rating System was from the 1993 State Rating System and have been carried forward into the 2014. Criteria include:

- SC 1.2 Wetland unit ≥ 1 acre in size and meets at least two of the following three conditions? YES = Category I; NO = Category II
 - The wetland is relatively undisturbed
 - 100 ft buffer on at least $\frac{3}{4}$ of the landward edge
 - ≥ 2 of the following features: tidal channels, depressions with open water, or contiguous freshwater wetlands.

Hruby, T. (2004). Washington State Wetland Rating System for Western Washington: 2004 Revised. (Publication #04-06-025). Olympia, WA: Washington Department of Ecology

Mr. Anderson explained in its current condition, Edmonds Marsh only meets the last provision; it does have tidal channels, depressions with open water and it is contiguous with a freshwater wetland but it does not have an intact 100-foot buffer on $\frac{3}{4}$ of the perimeter and it is disturbed (filled, ditched, piped and there is not free tidal exchange). That is why Ecology determined it to be a Category II wetland. Category II wetlands are still high quality wetlands, they still require a relatively wide buffer (150 feet) and Ecology is not saying only a 50-foot buffer on the entire wetland, it would be whatever the buffer is in the CAO. Where there is intact buffer in the southeast corner, all the existing buffer on the wetland needs to be protected. A 50-foot buffer would be where there will be redevelopment and that area would be restored to buffer. He assured it was not that Ecology does not favor restoration; Edmonds Marsh is a great asset to the City but Ecology is cautious due to legal mechanisms regarding how Ecology and City get there via the SMP.

He displayed oblique aerial photographs of estuarine wetlands:

- North Fork Skagit River Delta
 - Intact tidal channels, free tidal exchange
 - No development around it
 - Contiguous on the backside with freshwater wetlands
 - Category I
- Elger Bay, Camano Island
 - Free tidal exchange, no pipes or dikes
 - Wood occurs naturally and not considered a disturbance
 - May not have 100-foot buffer on at least $\frac{3}{4}$ of perimeter (only need to meet 2 of 3 criteria)
 - Category I
- Swan Lake, Island County

- Some adjacent development
- Inlet and outlet piped and diked
- Agricultural on back side
- May be Category II
- Edmonds Marsh
 - Fully developed around wetland
 - Does not have free tidal exchange, piped
 - Does not have intact buffer
 - Category II

Mr. Lien displayed aerial photographs and described the differences:

- Council Approved
 - 50-foot vegetation buffer
 - 100-foot setback from the edge of marsh
 - 200-foot shoreline jurisdiction
 - Edmonds Marsh
- Ecology Required
 - 50-foot vegetation buffer (with redevelopment of 50% of the shoreline area)
 - 65-foot setback from the edge of the marsh
 - 200-foot shoreline jurisdiction
 - Edmonds Marsh

Councilmember Tibbott referred to the definition of restoration (page 779 of the packet), for example, ecological restoration means the establishment or reestablishment or upgrading of impaired ecological shoreline and describes an elaborate process. However, in conclusion it states, “In this SMP, restoration is used broadly to include conservation and enhancement actions. Conservation is different from restoration as described above in that it protects areas relatively free of degradation.” Councilmember Tibbott said he was trying to understand what level of restoration is expected in the SMP and, from Ecology’s point of view, what does it take to improve a buffer. Mr. Pater reiterated the State cannot require restoration, it is a voluntary element of the SMP. If the buffer is restored, whether as part of redevelopment of Harbor Square, the Unocal site or the Port, it will improve the marsh. Under the changes where the marsh enhancement is triggered by 50% redevelopment, that is mitigation because redevelopment will likely intensify the land use along the shoreline, possibly building heights, residential or mixed use, etc. Therefore, enhancement is necessary to maintain the overall no net loss of ecological function of the marsh. He summarized there is a difference between restoration and mitigation.

Councilmember Tibbott asked how enhancements could be done on a dike. Mr. Anderson answered his understanding was the dike would not be touched; planting would occur landward of the dike. If that occurred in the 50-foot zone, the pavement would be removed and trees and shrubs planted but the dike would remain in its current state. He said trees and dikes generally do not get along, eventually trees fall over which threaten the integrity of the dike. He has not seen any specific proposals but discussion has been that the dike will remain in its current configuration.

Councilmember Mesaros referred to public comments about preserving the marsh as well as improving it. He recalled hearing last week that the real threat to the marsh is runoff, not whether the buffer is 65 or 100 feet. Even with a 100-foot buffer, there is too much runoff into the marsh. He expressed interest in establishing a buffer that encouraged the property owners surrounding the marsh to do restoration that keeps runoff out of marsh. For example, the Council may approve a 100-foot setback with a 50-foot buffer but that won’t improve the marsh. Unless something is done to stop runoff, the marsh will go away in 60-70 years due to runoff. Mr. Anderson agreed the greatest benefit to the marsh would be improving stormwater treatment. It was his understanding that should Harbor Square be redeveloped, that would be part of the proposal and they would be required to meet the City’s current stormwater manual guidelines.

and standards. Improving water quality is one of the greatest benefits to the marsh, fish and salmon within a sort range of the discharge of Willow Creek. Councilmember Mesaros said his goal is to improve the marsh in 10-20 years and taking steps to accomplish that by setting a policy and approving an SMP that encourages adjoining property owners to make those improvements.

Councilmember Teitzel referred to the Ecology Required photograph, explaining he looked at the survey work being done by the Port and it is not clear that the OHWM butts up against the levy; in some areas it appears it is a fair distance out. He asked what the white line on the Ecology Required photograph represented. Mr. Lien answered that is an estimate of the edge of marsh for planning purposes, it is not a delineation. The survey the Port had done surveyed their property line, not the edge of the marsh. With any development, a wetland report would be required that delineated the edge of the marsh, OHWM, location of setbacks and buffers, etc.

Council President Johnson referred to “Urban Mixed Use IV Required and Recommended Changes” (page 500 of packet), which states, “The City Council adopted the UMU IV environment as an interim designation (to be reviewed and finalized within two years after the SMP becomes effective).…” The City received a letter from Ecology dated June 27, 2016; which she assumed gave the City two years from that date to resolve that issue. She questioned why Ecology wanted the City to remove the UMU IV interim designation. Mr. Pater answered the interim designation was based on complete approval of the SMP by the State; the two years would begin on the date the SMP was effective, two weeks after final action by the State which has not happened yet. One of the reasons for the interim designation was to let the grant process play out for restoration and Ecology’s research found 100 feet was not needed to qualify for grants, only a minimum of 35 feet was needed to qualify for a grant (a grant standard not an ecological standard). Second, it was to allow time to get the parties together to work this out and consider how to improve the marsh in the long term, a process that has been going on for a while. Given the level of information and the local record of the SMP, and the 50-foot buffer and 15-foot setback from the CAO for that classification of wetland, Ecology does not feel the interim designation is needed anymore.

Councilmember Buckshnis thanked the citizens who emailed and called her, she received 148 comments this week, and urged citizen to continue contacting her. She inquired about the code citation in the end summary regarding the setbacks and classification of the wetland, which states Ecology considers the Edmonds Marsh to be classified as a Class 2 wetland under City’s CAO ECDC 24.40.020. Mr. Lien referred to Mr. Anderson’s comment that one of the CAO updates adopted the 1993 and the 2004 Wetland Rating System. The updated COA references wetland ratings in ECDC 23.50.010.B which is the adopted Washington State Department of Ecology Wetland Rating System found in 2014 Washington State Wetland Ranking System for Western Washington, Ecology Publication 14-06-029, and those are the standards that Mr. Anderson used to identify the classification. The critical area regulations do not not classify the marsh or any other wetland, they adopted Ecology’s publication for classification of wetlands. The CAO adopt a 75-foot buffer for a Class 2 estuarine wetland.

Councilmember Nelson expressed appreciation for comment from citizen comments and the Audubon Society about not a degraded marsh but a thriving marsh with wildlife. He was confident everyone wanted to preserve the marsh and wildlife. He relayed hearing essentially that some development will benefit the marsh. He read from Ecology’s “At Home with Wetlands, A Landowner’s Guide,” “Throughout our history, wetlands have suffered at the hands of humans, whether through indifference, exploitation or misguided use, we have damaged or destroyed most of Washington’s wetlands. Even now – in spite of our new understanding of the ecological importance of wetland – degradation continues and we are still losing hundreds of acres of wetlands a year. With regards to fish and wildlife, many species of birds, fish, mammals, reptiles, and amphibians rely on wetland habitat for breeding, foraging, and cover. The special wetland conditions provide unique habitat for species that cannot survive elsewhere. Many endangered and threatened species such as salmon require wetlands during a part of their lifecycle. The incredibly high rate of wetlands loss has contributed to their demise. People versus wetlands: urban

growth and development also count for significant historical losses in wetlands. Washington's coastal urban areas have already lost 90-98% of the estuarine wetlands and the Puget Sound basin has lost 70% of its wetlands due to development and other activities. When we degrade a wetland, we diminish or lose some or all of its functions." He asked whether development will help or hurt the marsh. Mr. Anderson answered it is hoped development will help the marsh by providing an incentive for additional buffer on the north and south sides, areas that are already developed and do not provide a functional buffer. Redevelopment will actually benefit the marsh once the SMP is adopted with these standards. Without redevelopment, the currently developed degraded areas will remain in their existing state until a willing landowner voluntarily decides to do ecological restoration.

Councilmember Nelson asked if redevelopment has equaled no net loss. Mr. Anderson answered no net loss is based on the current conditions, when the SMP is adopted or when the inventory characterization takes place; it does not look backward, it looks at current conditions.

Councilmember Tibbott referred to the comment that after studying the 65-foot buffer and setback, Ecology was satisfied with 65 feet versus 75 or 100 feet and asked what level of science that represents and if Ecology was prepared to defend that evaluation and the 65-foot buffer in the event of legal action. Mr. Pater answered Ecology was comfortable a very supportive record has been provided to back up the proposed change to 65 feet. Councilmember Tibbott asked if Council has seen that record. Mr. Pater answered yes, it was part of the conditional approval and Mr. Anderson's analysis of the marsh's jurisdictional issues and the buffer issues and the unique situation is part of these findings and conclusions. Ecology was confident about the record from an ecological standpoint. With regard to defending the SMP, Mr. Pater answered absolutely, the SMA is a state/local partnership, if the City approves the SMP, Ecology will be there with the City to defend an appeal. Councilmember Tibbott asked if Ecology would defend it based on BAS. Mr. Pater answered it would be defended based on the record at the time of approval; BAS and no net loss are part of the record.

Councilmember Mesaros followed up on Councilmember Nelson's reading, agreeing that development has injured wetlands throughout western Washington; something has to be done to turn the tide. He believed the 50-foot buffer and another 50-foot setback would not encourage change. Unless change is encouraged, this marvelous asset will continue to be destroyed. Of the Councilmembers, he lives the closest to the marsh and has seen the resident coyote several times, noting a coyote pair had puppies last year. The marsh is a wonderful asset for the City and he hoped Councilmembers would join him in doing something to encourage change and create incentives or what Councilmember Nelson read will continue.

Councilmember Teitzel echoed Councilmembers Nelson and Mesaros' comments, noting all the Councilmembers and citizens want the marsh preserved and restored so that salmon, fish, birds, and wildlife thrive; the question is how to get there. He has studied the SMP and looked at the Comprehensive Plan and other documents in an effort to look at this from the 10,000-foot level; it is easy to get into minutia. He read from the draft SMP, "The purposes of this Master Program are...B. To promote uses and development of the City of Edmonds shoreline consistent with the City of Edmonds Comprehensive Plan while protecting and restoring environmental resources." He read from page 43, Activity Centers, Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan, "Balanced (re)development - strategically plan for development and redevelopment that achieves a balanced and coordinated approach to economic development and housing along with cultural and environmental goals." As Councilmember Mesaros said, sensible development can help the environment; stormwater runoff is significant problem for the marsh. He recommended looking at the big picture, and as the Comprehensive Plan instructs, look to the environment as a top priority. Another high priority is to ensure development occurs sensibly in concert and in harmony with the environment. He summarized the goal for the marsh is to preserve, protect and enhance it and also allow for sensible development near the marsh.

Council President Johnson asked why Ecology did not not recommend a 75-foot setback as per their own regulations. Mr. Pater answered due to the unique conditions of marsh. Unfortunately, the marsh is surrounded by asphalt, the railroad, and the dike and has a lot of challenges. The presence of the dike does not allow the reestablished buffer to function normally especially from a water quality perspective. Buffers usually provide some filtration for water quality; the presence of the dike makes that function problematic. Redevelopment is key because significant redevelopment of the site will require compliance with more modern stormwater regulations, low impact development techniques, etc. to filter and clean the stormwater. Mr. Anderson agreed the presence of the dike diminishes the effect of the buffer. It was his understanding there were also legal concerns that mitigation needs to be proportional and there needs to be a nexus with the impact. In this case it would be a more intensive land use with residential development that could impact marsh, thereby providing a nexus. With regard to proportionality, Ecology felt 50 feet was defensible and 75 feet may not be.

Council President Johnson said if the standard is 75 feet, why didn't Ecology rely on their standard. Mr. Anderson answered this is restoration of a lawfully established use which is different than what the buffer should be where there is intact natural vegetation. Mr. Pater said this is a redevelopment-triggered mitigation as compensation from a more intensive land use. That is different than a wetland with an established buffer that needs enhancement. There is minimal buffer and it is not high quality along Harbor Square and the Unocal site.

Council President Johnson pointed out this is a new shoreline jurisdiction and some areas are developed and some are not which should require looking at both the northern and southern sides. Mr. Lien explained the UMU IV applies to both sides of the marsh. He displayed an aerial map, explaining there are different buffers that apply around the marsh. Within shoreline jurisdiction, the 50-foot buffer and 65-foot setback apply. Outside shoreline jurisdiction, the critical area regulations would apply. He identified an area in the southeast corner of the marsh that has an established buffer, advising the City's CAO would apply there and the 75-foot intact buffer would be protected. The BAS reports were done in areas where there are intact buffers and determined the appropriate size for an intact buffer. The difficulty is applying that BAS to developed urban areas where buffers have been developed. Just saying there is a 75 or 100-foot buffer does not make it a buffer, if it is a developed area. Ecology is saying that allowing some redevelopment within an already developed area provides incentive to establish a buffer where the buffer is degraded or non-existent. One function buffers provide is water quality infiltration; due to the dike, the buffer cannot perform that function. Another function buffers provide is habitat; while the marsh has some good habitat as indicated by the number of birds, establishing a wider buffer does not provide a connection to other habitat which is another reason a 50-foot buffer makes sense versus a wider buffer.

Councilmember Buckshnis thanked Mr. Lien, commenting she has learned a lot from him and from WRIA 8. She asked Ecology if they have seen the Edmonds Marsh water monitoring report prepared by the Edmonds-Woodway High School Students Saving Salmon Stream Team. Mr. Lien advised Ms. Hope had forwarded that to them. Councilmember Buckshnis asked if they saw that the stormwater runoff is on other side of Shellabarger and the majority of petroleum is not actually in the marsh. Mr. Anderson said it was not detected at the points where the water was sampled. The current stormwater system in Harbor Square is not up to today's standards and there would be benefits of upgrading. Councilmember Buckshnis referred to studies done by the UW in areas where redevelopment cannot occur where sand and other materials are used to filter the water such as near 520. Redevelopment may be an alternative but redevelopment also comes with other issues such as additional people, cars, etc. The Students Saving Salmon are giving a presentation to WRIA 8 tomorrow.

Councilmember Nelson referred to the question Mr. Lien posed, what is the goal of marsh and Mr. Pater's statement at the last meeting that the marsh is not functioning properly, commenting the goal should be to have the marsh function properly. He asked whether Ecology or another state agency currently monitor or assess wetlands. Mr. Anderson said there is an ongoing national effort this summer directed by the US

Environmental Protection Agency, the National Wetland Condition Assessment, that Ecology is participating in. Ecology does compliance follow-up following a permit for a wetland fill. Ecology has an environmental assessment program that primarily does water quality monitoring but he was not aware of any current monitoring efforts.

Councilmember Nelson observed for all the wetlands that are within 200 feet of the shoreline, no one is tracking that there is in fact no net loss. Mr. Pater said that is expected once the SMPs are approved and implemented to see how effective they are over time. Councilmember Nelson commented the no net loss policy has been in place for 20 years, yet no monitoring has been done. Mr. Pater said it has not been in place 20 years, only since the SMP state guidelines were approved in late 2003. A lot of SMPs have been approved and in effect for a number of years; the expectation has been as funds are earmarked there would be some follow-up regarding how effective the SMPs are with regard to no net loss on a programmatic basis which is related to project specific impacts. Mr. Anderson said George W. Bush made a statement that there would be a federal policy of no net loss; that has not been achieved on a national basis. Washington has done a better job because of follow-up on mitigation but there is still a loss of acreage in the State as time goes on.

Mayor Earling advised this topic will return to Council for further discussion/review on August 2. He thanked Mr. Anderson and Mr. Pater for attending to respond to Council questions.

1. LONG-RANGE FINANCIAL PLAN INTRODUCTION

Finance Director Scott James said staff's goal is to provide the Council, Mayor and citizens and others financial documents that are easy to understand and provide a sense of transparency, for example the budget process. During the budget process, decision packages are used to describe additions to the budget. Staff also provides monthly financial reports to the Council that contain detailed information regarding revenues, expenses and fund balances. Another example is the annual audited financial report. Although important, these reports have a limited sight, looking at annual numbers versus a long range financial plan that looks into the future. He reviewed:

- What is a "Long-range" Financial Plan?
 - Combines financial forecasting with financial strategizing
 - Does not simply project the status quo "x" numbers of years into the future
 - A technical tool to identify problems and opportunities
 - Provide an avenue for Council, citizens & staff to discuss policy
 - Provides a road map for where the City wants to go
 - Can help build consensus for making financial decisions
 - Fundamental Elements of Long-range financial plans include:
 - Multi-year planning horizon
 - List range of funds to be included in plan
 - Schedule frequency for updates
 - Identify important policies
- Why do Councilmembers and Council as a whole need a Financial Plan?
 - Enable City's financial management to identify emerging problems & communicate them to elected officials and the public
 - Help the City to plan for a consistent level of essential services over a multi-year period
 - Stimulate long-term thinking
 - Stimulate "big-picture" thinking
 - Raise specific issues
 - Clarify the City's strategic intent
 - Integrate discipline
 - Communicate to citizens
 - Demonstrate good management to bond rating agencies and subsequent lower interest costs

- How is a plan put together?
 - Long-term financial planning is a multi-step process with four major phases
 - 1) Mobilization
 - Mobilization is the first step of getting ready to plan
 - Identify the leader of the planning process
 - Identify Planning Committee participants
 - Current committee: Councilmembers Teitzel and Johnson, Scott James, three citizens, Public Works Director, Parks Director
 - Define the purpose of the long-range financial planning process itself
 - Design the process that the plan will follow
 - Conduct a preliminary fiscal analysis
 - Look at service level preferences and related policies
 - Look at financial policies
 - The committee and Council need to reach a consensus on these points
 - 2) Analysis
 - Dedicated to producing information that supports the planning and strategizing of the decision phase. This phase covers:
 - Information gathering
 - Trend projections
 - Fund balance analysis
 - 3) Decision
 - After the analysis phase is completed, the Committee presents the results to Council so you can use the information to decide how you will respond to the information
 - These decisions will result in a set of financial strategies for bettering the financial position of the City
 - The strategies can be used to address an actual weakness or potential weakness in the City's financial structure
 - During this phase, the Team helps identify methods for developing financial strategies that encourages participation from all levels
 - The plan ultimately is brought before Council for adoption
 - 4) Execution
 - After the plan has been developed and adopted by Council, it is time to put the plan into action
 - The budget is the primary tool for executing the plan
 - Other tools are:
 - Policy statements
 - Council resolutions & ordinances
 - Performance measures
 - Action plans
 - After the plan is put into place, progress must be monitored. This involves determining how status reporting and timing of reporting will take place
- Who benefits from having a plan?
 - Citizens
 - Council
 - Businesses looking to locate in the City
 - Department heads & staff
- What are the timelines for building a plan?

When	July	August	September	October	November	2017
Who	Council & Staff	Council & Staff	Council & Staff	Council & Staff	Council & Staff	Council & Staff
What	Staff Introduction of Long-range	Update on LRFP purpose & progress to	Review of Preliminary Fiscal	This item is not directly related to plan	This item is not directly related to plan	Look at City's Financial Policies,

	Financial Planning to Council	date Solicit Council input on LRFP process & General Discussion of Plan	Analysis & Purpose of the Long-range Financial Planning Process, and begin discussion with Council on Service Level Preferences	development but requires Council & staff: Mayor's 2017 Preliminary Budget Delivered to Council	development but requires Council & staff: Council review of the proposed 2017 Budget & adoption of 2017 Budget	Long-range Financial Planning Committee share their consensus on topics discussed to this point. Next steps are completing Analysis, Decision & Execution Phases of Plan
Product	Introduce concepts and process for creating a long-range financial plan for Edmonds	List of Council's elements to include Long-range Financial Plan	Preliminary Fiscal Analysis & Purpose of the Long-range Financial Planning Process	2017 Preliminary Budget	2017 Budget	Complete all four phases of Long-range Financial Plan. Council adoption of Plan
Venue	Council Study Session July 13, 2016	Council Study Session August 2016	Council Study Session September 2016	Council Meeting October 11, 2016	October - November Council Meetings	Council Study Sessions & Council Meetings

Councilmember Buckshnis requested the City provide Councilmembers the book, "Elected Official's Guide to Long-Term Financial Planning for Local Governments." She commented on improvements in financial reporting since she was a citizen in 2009 and efforts to put out fires in recent years instead of planning. Mr. James also recommended the book as an introduction to long range financial planning; it offers insights for those interested in learning about long range planning.

Councilmember Tibbott said he found the presentation very helpful; long range planning helps give a sense of security regarding where the City is going and what to expect. He also supported the opportunity that long range financial planning provides for discussions with citizens. He looked forward to hearing the results of the committee and participating in a dialogue that will result in a robust plan.

Councilmember Teitzel said the message is not that the process is broken; the City is functioning, budgets are being prepared, etc. Long range planning is a way to improve the process and bring more discipline and transparency to the process and move away from silo budgeting. He was pleased to be a part of the team and has enjoyed working with Mr. James. Mr. James said the City has been on strong financial footing; the intent of a long range financial plan is to lessen impacts of a downturn.

9. MAYOR'S COMMENTS

Mayor Earling encouraged Councilmembers and the public to watch tomorrow's sandcastle building contest at the waterfront, a fun, creative event where typically, 50-150 people participate. He reminded of the Snohomish County Cities meeting on Thursday and encouraged Councilmembers to attend the AWC district meeting at Scott's on October 20.

10. COUNCIL COMMENTS

Councilmember Nelson reported he was invited to attend the 100 anniversary of Boeing by a family member who works for Boeing. He enjoyed seeing the wonderful work Boeing has achieved in 100 years as well as meeting current and retired workers and learning about the buildings they worked in and the

planes they worked on. As a plane buff, it was very impressive. He commended the Edmonds citizens who currently work for Boeing workers or have in the past and he found the work they have done inspired.

Referencing events of the past few weeks, Councilmember Buckshnis paraphrased a quote from Muhammad Ali, "If we practice an eye for an eye, soon we will all be blind."

Council President Johnson reminded of the Walk Back in Time featuring Civil War Veterans at the Edmonds Cemetery at 1:00 p.m. on Thursday.

Councilmember Teitzel said he has talked to several citizens and read comments in My Edmonds about the elimination of the drive-up mailbox at the 2nd & Main post office. Due to concern with the difficulty for the elderly and others with physical challenges getting out of their car to drop off mail, he contacted the postmaster and learned post office views eliminating the mail box as cost-saving measure as first-class mail volumes have been declining and that the drive-up mail box is no longer needed. Councilmember Teitzel said he assured the postmaster a drive-up mailbox close to downtown is needed. The postmaster indicated if 2-3 locations were identified, he would consider them. Councilmember Teitzel said he is working with Public Works Director Phil Williams to identify 2-3 sites and meeting with the postmaster.

Councilmember Mesaros encouraged everyone to attend the ECA's 10th Anniversary bash on July 30th. The all-day event is free and further information is available in My Edmonds News and on the ECA website.

Councilmember Tibbott reported on improvements occurring in the City including Veteran's Plaza, replacement of the bandshell at Frances Anderson Center, a downtown restroom, street repairs and overlays, reconstruction of the fishing pier and construction of a new post office. Observing one notable projects not on the list, Sunset Avenue, he encouraged the Council and staff to have a plan in place for Sunset Avenue by fall.

11. CONVENE IN EXECUTIVE SESSION REGARDING PENDING OR POTENTIAL LITIGATION PER RCW 42.30.110(1)(i)

This item was not needed.

12. RECONVENE IN OPEN SESSION. POTENTIAL ACTION AS A RESULT OF MEETING IN EXECUTIVE SESSION

This item was not needed.

13. ADJOURN

With no further business, the Council meeting was adjourned at 9:57 p.m.